

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-48 remain pending. Claims 2-16 and 23-48 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 17-22 have been rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled or amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 17-19, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,452 to Wang, et al. ("Wang"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,848,179 to Ubhayakar ("Ubhayakar"). Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Ubhayakar, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,684,448 to Jacobsen, et al. ("Jacobsen").

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 17-22 include limitations that are not disclosed by the cited references, individually or in combination. Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A computer controlled display device, comprising:  
a flat panel display having an input for receiving display data;  
a base housing a computer; and  
a moveable assembly extending from said flat panel display to said base, said moveable assembly having a cross-sectional area that is less than a cross-sectional area of a display structure of said flat panel display, wherein said moveable assembly is articulated to provide at least three degrees of freedom for said flat panel display relative to said base.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes a flat panel display coupled to a base housing a computer via a moveable assembly. The moveable assembly has a cross-section area that is less than a cross-sectional area of a display structure of the flat panel display. The moveable assembly also provides at least three degrees of freedom of the flat panel display relative to the base that houses a computer. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are not disclosed or

suggested by the cited references.

Although Wang discloses a flat panel display system of a computer; however, Wang fails to disclose a base housing a computer and a moveable assembly coupling the base with a flat panel display, where the moveable assembly has a cross-sectional area that is less than the display structure of the flat panel display. Rather, Wang's computer has a thin plate as a base that does not house a computer. Instead, the stand (e.g., base stand) houses a Wang's computer. As a result, the cross sectional area of the base stand is almost the same as the flat panel display (see, Figs. 1-2 and col. 2; lines 17-62 of Wang).

Although the Office Action acknowledged that Wang fails to disclose a moveable assembly that provides at least three degrees of freedom in supporting the flat panel display; nevertheless, the Office Action maintained that Ubhayakar discloses a moveable assembly that provides at least three degrees of freedom in supporting the flat panel display. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ubhayakar is related to a flexible robotic arm used in a robot instead of a computer, particularly, a moveable assembly supporting a flat panel display of a computer (see Abstract of Ubhayakar). There is no disclosure or suggestion within Ubhayakar that such a structure can be used in a computer, particularly, as a moveable assembly coupling a flat panel display and a base housing a computer. In fact, the robotic arm of Ubhayakar appears requiring one end of the robotic arm to be mounted on a wall (see, Figs 2, 8, 11a-11c, and 12a=12d), rather being coupled to a base housing a computer as required by claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Wang and Ubhayakar are dealing with significantly different problems and their designs are significantly different. It is respectfully submitted that one with ordinary skill in the art, based on the teachings of Wang and Ubhayakar, would not combine these two references. Such a combination lacks reasonable expectation of

success. Furthermore, although Jacobsen mentioned a term of "shape memory"; Jacobsen is related to a shape memory switch that is unrelated to a shape-memory metal shaft used in the moveable assembly for coupling a flat panel display with a base housing a computer. Again, the fields of these cited references are significantly different and one with ordinary skill in the art would not, based on the teachings of these references, combine with one another. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 17-22 are patentable over the cited references set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: June 19, 2006

  
Kevin G. Shao  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45,095  
Kevin\_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300